

# America's

# FUTURE

A Weekly Review of News, Books and Public Affairs

Volume 2

June 3, 1960

Number 23

Victory From a Failure . . . . .	1
Neither Friends Nor Enemies . . . . .	2
Never a Thaw . . . . .	3
An Interim Report . . . . .	5
At Its Beck and Call . . . . .	7
Other 49 Please Copy . . . . .	7

## VICTORY FROM A FAILURE

Now that most of the post-mortems have been held on the fiasco at the summit, perhaps we can take a somewhat saner look at the whole episode. Despite everything the 'be-kind-to-communists' clique said, there was nothing tragic for America about the summit failure. The opposite is true - it was a major victory for the United States. I know it sounds strange to call a failure a victory. But consider the following facts:

First, Khrushchev's scuttling of the Paris meeting

saved us from another Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, or Geneva. Those were the other summits at which so many major concessions were made to the Red leaders.

Second, after all these years, perhaps a supremely important fact might finally penetrate the minds of our leaders - the fact that summit meetings with the Reds are the height of foolishness. Of all things, even the New York Times now admits that such meetings have proved a practical failure! It says

'they have merely provided the Soviets with a propaganda forum' - which is exactly what we have been saying all along. The only sad thing is that the lesson had to be brought home to us with unprecedented insults to an American President. Evidently the only public figure on whom the lesson was lost was Mr. Adlai Stevenson. It seems to me Mr. Stevenson, who has become a sort of perennial presidential candidate, might have waited a little while before he added his own insults to those the President had to take from Boss Khrushchev. Stevenson, of course, promptly got the backing of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. But this was not so strange. After all, it was her husband who gave the Reds everything they wanted at Teheran and at Yalta.

Third, is it too much to hope that the whole episode will now result in a foreign policy formed in the interest of America, and not in the interest of a so-called ally who does not yet realize it is no longer a world power? Mr. Eisenhower was always reluctant about summits and exchanges of visits with the Red Boss. But he was talked into them by the British leaders. It is interesting to note how the spy plane incident - which Khrushchev used as an excuse to kill the summit meeting - was treated in Europe. West German and French newspapers generally defended the United States. But British newspapers indulged in a tirade against America which was even worse, according to some observers, than anything printed in the Soviet press at the time.

## NEITHER FRIENDS NOR ENEMIES

One major accomplishment of the summit bust-up is supposed to be a new solidarity between what are called the Western allies. But it might be well if we did not count too heavily on this, especially in the case of Great Britain. I am not blaming Britain for any position she takes where

Soviet Russia is concerned. England always acts strictly for what she believes to be British interests, which is understandable. My only quarrel is with American leaders who so often confuse British with American interests, and thus permit our foreign policy to be formed according to

America's

## FUTURE

Published every week by America's Future, Inc., 542 Main Street, New Rochelle, New York. A non-profit, educational organization.

R. K. Scott . . . . . Publisher  
 Rosalie M. Gordon . . . . . Editor  
 John C. Wetzel . . . . . Business Manager

Subscription Price: \$5 per year, \$12 for three years. Ten week trial subscription \$1. Additional copies of specific issues: 1 copy for 15¢; 10 copies for \$1; 50 for \$4; 100 for \$6; 1,000 for \$30 - each price for bulk mailing to one person.

Second class mail privileges authorized at New Rochelle, New York.

Britain's interests rather than our own. And those interests are not always the same. In fact, most often they are at opposite ends of the pole.

At the present time, Great Britain is faced with a very difficult situation. Her once great empire, as the result of two world wars, is practically gone. On the continent of Europe - where she has always tried to maintain a so-called balance of power - she sees the new Common Market, and the surprising collaboration between West Germany and France, as a distinct threat to her position in world trade. At home, she is bedeviled by a population heavily infected with the socialist virus. So some kind

of deal - almost any kind of deal - with Soviet Russia looks good to her. This is why her leaders brought so much pressure to bear on President Eisenhower to treat the Red leaders with kind words and jolly meetings. For the moment, due to Khrushchev's violent diatribes at Paris, it may seem that Britain realizes it is impossible to deal with Reds except on Red terms. But it would be well for Americans always to keep in mind an unconsciously frank statement by a British leader of the 19th Century. Lord Palmerston's remark became famous but is seldom remembered now. He said that Great Britain had neither friends nor enemies, only interests. That is still her policy today.

## NEVER A THAW

Of course, we are getting the usual batch of foolish pronouncements in the wake of the summit failure. Perhaps the most foolish statement is that the cold war is on again - and is colder than ever. The implication is that for a while, relations between the Red Slave State and the free world were bathed in a warm glow. Nothing could be more

ridiculous. The cold war was always as cold as ever, despite the seeming thaw as a result of the so-called 'Spirit of Camp David.' What happened simply was this.

The Red leaders, under terrific pressures because of mounting troubles behind the Iron Curtain, needed visits and meetings with the Western leaders for their propaganda value. They also needed some international deals in their favor. That is why they wanted another summit meeting - because they had every reason to expect, from past experience, that it would result in further concessions for them. But it became apparent, as the time for the Paris meeting approached, that the United States was going to stand firm on its obligations to West Berlin. This meant there was nothing the Red leaders could gain from that summit meeting, which they had worked so hard to bring about. So Khrushchev seized on the plane incident to wreck the meeting. If it had not been the plane incident, it would have been something else, as Secretary Herter correctly said. And despite Khrushchev's guttersnipe insults and boasts, he backed down once again on West Berlin

- which has always been the case when the Reds understand we mean what we say.

In other words, there never was any thaw in the cold war except in the minds of deluded Americans who fell for communist propaganda moves. But you can always count on the Big Spenders in Washington to seize on any excuse to spend more. So they talk about the 'resumption' of the cold war - and actually try to force on the Defense Department more money than it wants or can spend. The Director of the Budget, Maurice Stans, declared that these Big Spenders are trying to stampede Americans into a suicidal policy of what he called 'keeping up with the Khrushchevs.' Mr. Stans said he does not believe that the Soviets will catch up to the United States in seven, or 27, years unless - and here is the big point - 'unless we play into their hands by moving farther and farther from conservative national fiscal policies.'

What Mr. Stans means is that the communist idea can win in America - not from military attack by the Soviet Union, but from those who would force the United States to spend itself into bankruptcy. If these Big Spenders

are really so concerned about America's position in the cold war, why do they not demand an end to the ban on nuclear testing? We have already wasted 18 months - during which we did not test any weapons - in fruitless negotiations with the Reds on this subject. And why do not these Big Spenders stop try-

ing to settle every issue with another grab at the American taxpayers' earnings? Why not, instead, demand that we withdraw diplomatic recognition from Red Russia? That would not cost the American taxpayer a cent -and it would deal the Red bosses a whopping big propaganda blow.

- John T. Flynn

*Foregoing items covered in Mutual network broadcast 5/29/60*

\*\*\*\*\*

## AN INTERIM REPORT

Six months ago we brought you news of an AMERICA'S FUTURE project which, we are glad to say, was welcomed by all the citizens interested in the improvement of our public schools. It also, of course, came in for a few sneers and smears from the Liberal Establishment. But we expected that - in fact we wear its disapproval as a badge of honor.

The Textbook Evaluation Committee of AMERICA'S FUTURE, made up of more than a dozen distinguished educators and writers, would undertake to analyze and review high-school textbooks, primarily in the Social Sciences. The objective? That parents, school-board members, teach-

ers, might have that which they had never had before -an authoritative opinion on the context, slant (if any) and value of the books from which American youngsters are being taught.

It is with pride and pleasure that we now bring you an interim report on the progress of this undertaking.

First, let us say that, as in the case of general books, of the making of textbooks there is no end. Our project, therefore, is far from complete. No doubt it never will be. But given our limited funds and facilities, we are justly proud of the progress we have made - progress which would have been impossible

without the devoted cooperation of the members of the Textbook Evaluation Committee.

The bare statistics are as follows: There are completed and available to all interested citizens 50 evaluations or reviews. Another 22 are in process of completion. In addition, 50 more texts are now being assigned for evaluation and should be ready by the time the new school term opens in the Fall. This will provide a total of 122 evaluated texts. Additional volumes will be covered just as fast as funds and facilities permit. Also, we invite suggestions from readers as to books they would like to see evaluated. But please, for

Anthony Bouscaren  
Neil Carothers  
Medford Evans  
A. H. Hobbs  
Willmoore Kendall  
Russell Kirk  
Ella Lonn

The secretary of the Textbook Evaluation Committee is Mr. George A. Membrez, Jr. Mr. Membrez is a teacher, school-board member, and educational consultant to the vice-president of a large industrial corporation.

We will keep you informed

the time being, limit your suggestions to the Social Sciences field at the high-school level.

A list of the reviewed textbooks, and the evaluations themselves, may be had by writing to AMERICA'S FUTURE, INC., 542 Main Street, New Rochelle, New York.

Several new and distinguished members have been added to the already exemplary Textbook Evaluation Committee. For readers who came in late the following are the names of the full committee as of this date. We regret that space precludes giving their eminent connections and authorships, but complete details are available on request:

Marie R. Madden  
J. B. Matthews  
William M. McGovern  
Felix Morley  
E. Merrill Root  
Hans F. Sennholz  
Charles Callan Tansill

as to continued progress. Meantime, while far too many of the texts reviewed have proved most revealing of the mind-conditioning - even brainwashing - so prevalent among our youth, it has been a pleasant experience (and one we hope will become in-

creasingly so) to have discovered at least a few texts which can be recommended as

sound, fair, and balanced food for the minds of the coming generations.

## AT ITS BECK AND CALL

"Russia does not have to fly over us. It has the American Communist Party at its beck and call. They pick up all the information Russia wants.

"We pick up a Russian spy every other hour, but unlike us, Russia has no Supreme Court to let off these traitors like we have."

- Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby (Ret.)

## OTHER 49 PLEASE COPY

An Indiana congressman recently complained that he had been unsuccessful in getting his state to take one of the numerous federal handouts from the Washington bureaucrats. His state is Indiana. Her refusal stemmed from a joint resolution passed by the Indiana legislature back in 1945. It read in part:

"Indiana needs no guardian and intends to have none. We Hoosiers - like the people of our sister states - were fooled for quite a spell with the magicians' trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington will be bigger when it comes back to us.

"We find that it has lost weight on its journey to Washing-

**AMERICA'S FUTURE, INC., 542 Main St., New Rochelle, N.Y.**

I understand you fill orders for books at regular list price, postage paid. Please mail me \_\_\_\_\_ copies of the book noted below. My check for \$ \_\_\_\_\_ is enclosed ☐ Please bill me ☐.

Book I want is \_\_\_\_\_

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

ton and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 states."

---

AMERICA'S FUTURE, INC.  
542 Main St. New Rochelle N Y

Second-Class Postage  
Paid at New Rochelle,  
New York



